

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action mailed April 16, 2008.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

In the specification paragraphs [0001] and [0051] were objected to because the application numbers referenced were missing.

Claims 1-90 remain in this application.

In the Office Action that was mailed April 16, 2008:

Claims 1-7, 11-14, 17-23, 28-43, 45-49, 52, 57-70, 72-76 and 82-90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kolls (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0156704);

Claims 8-10, 44, and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolls in view of Kato (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0036909);

Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolls in view of Reddy et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0227643);

Claims 24-27, 53-56, and 79-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolls in view of Carcoba Olivares et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0055835);

Claims 50, 51, 77, and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolls.

The Present Application

By way of brief review, the present application is directed toward a device for a collaboration and communication hub, including delayed and secure printing, faxing, telephone service, internet and email access, and data transfer between personal electronic devices and the public hub. The device can operate on a fee for service basis and can include a payment module that allows payment through currency, credit or debit card, or online payment service. The device includes displays on which

advertisements and information may display when the device is not in use. The multiple displays also allow multiple users to operate the device at one time. Users can connect to the device for data collaboration or sharing using wired or wireless methods.

The Cited References

In contrast, the primary reference of the Office action, Kolls, is directed toward a system for a cashless point of sale system designed to be embedded in vending machines and point of sale equipment. It is also directed toward a system to control and distribute interactive advertising, electronic mail, and control the billing of the use of copiers, phone, faxes, scanners, and other devices. Although Kolls mentions sensing when a user is approaching, it is respectfully submitted that Kolls does not disclose that the system determines whether the user is carrying an electronic device that can provide identification and a password to the user's account.

Kato is relied upon by the Office Action for disclosure of an interface device which interfaces with a multi function machine primarily based upon an audio input and an audio output. Based upon the audio inputs and outputs, the operator is able to navigate, using voice or audio input, through a multi-layered menu to select and specify operational items and conditions.

Reddy is directed to a document processing system which includes a document processing device (e.g., a copier), a host (e.g., a computer server), and a multi-device compatible interface for enabling operation of the host and the document processing device from among a plurality of different possible document processing devices. Reddy additionally is directed at the use of Bluetooth and IEEE 802.11 protocol for facilitating wireless communication between the devices.

Carcoba Olivares et al. is relied upon by the Office Action for disclosure of a communication and transaction center in form of a public kiosk for printing and other business related uses. Carcoba Olivares additionally discloses a system which allows the users to download and upload data from optical media.

The Claims are not Anticipated

Claims 1-7, 11-14, 17-23, 28-43, 45-49, 52, 57-70, 72-76 and 82-90 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kolls (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0156704).

Claim 1 has been amended and now recite *inter alia*: an authorization system which senses an approaching user and sends inquiries via wireless communications protocols to determine whether the user is carrying an electronic device that can provide identification and a password to the user's account.

It is respectfully submitted that Kolls does not disclose or suggest an authorization system which senses an approaching user and sends inquiries via wireless communications protocols to determine whether the user is carrying an electronic device that can provide identification and a password to the user's account. Koll does indicate that the system can be utilized to grant access to secure areas and a user's account but does not indicate that the authorization system senses an approaching user and sends inquiries via wireless communications protocols to determine whether the user is carrying an electronic device that can provide identification and a password to the user's account. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kolls does not anticipate or contemplate the multimedia communications/collaboration hub which sends inquiries via wireless communications protocols to determine whether an electronic device that can provide identification and a password to the user's account of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to **claim 1** are supported throughout the present application, including, for example, paragraph [0023] and paragraph [0049].

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that **claim 1**, as well as **claims 2-36**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated by Kolls.

Claims 37 and 66 were rejected for the same reasons as **claim 1**. Accordingly, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claim 1** are submitted in support of **claims 37 and 66**.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that **claims 37 and 66**, as well as **claims 38-65 and 67-90**, which depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Kolls.

With respect to **claim 6**, the Office Action asserts that Kolls discloses *inter alia*:

an audio file creation module in communication with the audio data handler module, which accepts audio inputs from the at least one audio input port and sends it to the audio file creation module, which encodes the audio data and stores it in a file.

It is respectfully submitted that Kolls does not disclose or suggest a audio file creation module which accepts audio inputs and encodes the audio data and stores it in a file. Kolls in cited paragraph [0139] does recite voice record and playback means. Kolls does not teach audio inputs that are accepted and sent to the audio file creation module, which then encode the audio data and stores it in a file. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kolls does not anticipate or contemplate the multimedia communications/collaboration hub which accepts audio inputs from the at least one audio input port and sends it to the audio file creation module, which encodes the audio data and stores it in a file.

Claims 42 and 69 were rejected for the same reasons as **claim 6**. Accordingly, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claim 6** are submitted in support of **claims 42 and 69**.

With respect to **claim 13**, the Office Action asserts that Kolls discloses *inter alia*: a video file creation module in communication with the video data handler module, which accepts video inputs from the at least one video input port and sends it to the video file creation module, which encodes the video data and stores it in a file.

It is respectfully submitted that Kolls does not disclose or suggest a video file creation module which accepts video inputs and encodes the video data and stores it in a file. Kolls, in cited paragraph [0143], does recite video record and playback means. Kolls does not teach video inputs that are accepted and sent to the video file creation module, which then encode the video data and stores it in a file. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kolls does not anticipate or contemplate the multimedia communications/collaboration hub which accepts video inputs from the at least one video input port and sends it to the video file creation module, which encodes the video data and stores it in a file.

Claims 47 and 74 were rejected for the same reasons as **claim 13**. Accordingly, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claim 13** are submitted in support of **claims 47 and 74**.

The Claims are not Obvious

Claims 27, 56 and 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolls in views of Carcoba Olivares et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0055835).

With regards to **claim 27**, the Office Action asserts that Kolls discloses the limitations recited in **claim 1**. However, as indicated above, this assertion is respectfully traversed, in regards to **claim 1** in its current amended form.

Additionally, the Office Action stipulates that Kolls does not disclose the subject matter of **claim 27** and asserts that Carcoba Olivares discloses the subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that Carcoba Olivares does not disclose or even suggest, even in combination with Koll, an optical media dispensary and that at least one UI element offering the user the ability to purchase optical media onto which the user can have selected data burned. Paragraph [0060] of the Carcoba Olivares application cited by the Office Action, simple allows an optical media to be used for uploading and downloading. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that Carcoba Olivares discloses an ID card dispenser and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to replace the ID card dispenser with that of an optical disk dispenser. It is respectfully submitted that nothing in this cited portion discloses or suggests an optical media dispensary and that at least one UI element offering the user the ability to purchase optical media onto which the user can have selected data burned. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace an ID card dispenser that is used to identify the user with that of an optical disk dispenser which is used to upload and download data to an optical media. The functions of the ID card dispenser and the optical disc dispenser are not related and do not address a common problem. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to look at replacing an ID card dispenser with an optical disc dispenser in order to provide the user with the ability to purchase optical media in order to download and upload data.

Claims 56 and 81 were rejected for the same reasons as **claim 27**. Accordingly, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claim 27** are submitted in support of

claims 56 and 81.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claims 27, 56, and 81** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of Kolls and Carcoba Olivares.

Claims 50 and 77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolls.

With regards to **claim 50**, the Office Action asserts that Kolls discloses the limitations recited in **claim 37**. However, as indicated above, this assertion is respectfully traversed, in regards to **claim 37** in its current amended form.

Additionally, the Office Action stipulates that Kolls teaches collaboration software allowing the at least one another device to share data and selectively simultaneously manipulate such data. It is respectfully submitted that Kolls does not disclose or even suggest collaboration software allowing the device to share data and simultaneously manipulate the shared data. The Examiner asserts paragraph [0077] of Kolls, that transmission over integrated service digital network (ISDN) suggests software to be implemented to be able to effectively communicate data, voice, audio, and video. It is respectfully submitted that nothing in this cited portion discloses or suggests collaboration allowing users to share data and simultaneously manipulate that data. ISDN is a system of digital phone connections that has been designed for sending voice, video, and data simultaneously over digital or ordinary phone lines. ISDN is the international communication standard for data transmission or sharing data along telephone lines. It is respectfully submitted that paragraph [0077] of Kolls, cited by the Office Action does not disclose or suggest that the use of ISDN suggests software which allows another device to simultaneously manipulate the shared data.

Claim 77 was rejected for the same reasons as **claim 50**. Accordingly, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claim 50** are submitted in support of **claim 77**.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claims 50 and 77** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of Kolls.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all remaining claims (**Claims 1-90**) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

This is an authorization under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3) to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time, as incorporating a petition for the appropriate extension of time.

Applicant hereby petitions the Commissioner under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and request a ONE-MONTH extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action. Payment for the \$ 460.00 extension of time fee is authorized to be charged to a Credit Card. The fees are being submitted via EFS-Web. If the Credit Card is unable to be charged, please charge the extension of time fees or credit any overpayment of extension of time fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0308.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any filing or prosecution fees which may be required, under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 (but not 1.18), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Patrick Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP



Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582

Date

